

Panel review is requested based on Applicants' position that the Examiner has failed to show that one or more of claims 1-14 are unpatentable over Schneiderman (US 20020156932) in view of various combinations of Kreller et al. (US 6,981,251), Yokoyama (US 20010029526), Wang (US 7,092,986), and Saulpaugh (US 7,016,966) in making an obviousness rejection (35 U.S.C. 103).

Please refer, for example, to the Response to Final Office Action filed by Applicants on March 25, 2008, at pages 5-9, and the Response to Office Action filed by Applicants on August 29, 2008, at pages 5-8, for relevant arguments made of record by Applicants.

Applicants maintain the position that Kreller, as well as the other cited references, fails to teach or suggest configuring a mobile agent to install a service object to be executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment.

As an initial matter, and despite the request of Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is consistently unclear as to which parts of the Kreller system he regards as a "mobile agent object" and a "service object" so as to afford Applicant a reasonable opportunity assess the merits of the Examiner's position.

Additionally, and assuming that Applicant's attorney understands to some degree the Examiner's position, it appears in Kreller that an agent system launcher is responsible for installation of "service programs." It is not clear to the Applicant's attorney that such "service programs" can properly be considered "service objects" as recited in the claims. However, assuming solely for the sake of argument that "service programs" are properly considered service objects, the question arises as to whether the agent system launcher is a mobile agent object as

recited in the claims. According to Kreller: "[so] that the mobile agents on the individual computers in the network can be active, these computers need to have a respective 'agent system'." (*see, e.g.*, Col. 2, lines 29-31 of Kreller). Consequently, it stands to reason that the mobile agents of which Kreller speaks cannot exist on a host before an agent system is installed. As the agent system launcher is part of the agent system, it is respectfully submitted that the agent system launcher is not, and cannot be, a mobile agent object. Moreover, there is otherwise no indication in Kreller that the agent system launcher is, itself, a mobile agent object.

Accordingly, the Applicants' attorney respectfully submits that the cited references, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed limitations.